

6 Multilateral interventions as a power-enhancing instrument

Rising powers' path from the periphery to the center

Nil Seda Satana

- Rising powers, norms, and peacekeeping: the Turkish case
- The changing nature of Turkey's role in international peacekeeping
- Turkey's normative responses to intervention
- Turkey and rising powers' soft power
- The path from the periphery to the center: rising middle power politics, norms, and peacekeeping
- Conclusion

This chapter extrapolates from Turkey's engagement in intervention issues to generate an enhanced understanding of rising powers'—and Brazil's—actions in this area. The new political elite in Turkey has fundamentally altered Turkish foreign policy since the *Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi* (Justice and Development Party—AKP) came to power in 2002. While the traditional foreign policy ensured the continuation of the status quo defined by alliance with the “West” under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)'s collective security umbrella, the new foreign policy is proactive and fluid. As Prime Minister Ahmet Davutoğlu has often publicly declared, Turkey is playing a new game where it seeks to shift its status in the current international system by increasing its “soft power”¹ to move from the periphery to the center. The AKP administration ultimately views power as a tool for carrying out policy objectives in a very dangerous geopolitical environment: the Middle East. Whereas previous governments depended on the United States and other Western allies, the AKP policy focuses on climbing up the ladder of the international hierarchy and rising from peripheral status to that of a rising middle or even great power in the system.

In other words, Turkey is attempting to reimagine and reassert its role and power in the current international system. This chapter outlines how international peacekeeping has played an instrumental role

in Turkey's use of power politics to enhance its position vis-à-vis other states. To do so, I examine the nature of Turkey's role in international interventions and peacekeeping, as well as its normative stance in global governance and how it responds to changing norms of international interventions such as the Responsibility to Protect (R2P).

An examination of Turkey's path from periphery to center reveals that it is by no means unique and indeed serves as a fruitful theory-building case for the elaboration of conclusions regarding other rising powers, including but clearly not limited to Brazil. This chapter argues that middle powers that have the capability and willingness to transform into rising powers use peace operations and intervention as instruments of bringing their "soft" and "hard" power to bear. The Turkish case is used to build a theoretical understanding of how and why rising powers act in the international system to enhance their status. Moreover, the insights gathered from the case are used to infer how Brazil might utilize its soft and hard power instrumentally. The implications of the chapter are important for Brazil, as well as other rising middle powers, to show that seemingly altruistic missions such as blue helmet operations can be instruments of power used to challenge the existing global distribution of power.

Rising powers, norms, and peacekeeping: the Turkish case

From the collapse of the Ottoman Empire and the establishment of the new Republic in 1923 until the mid-1990s, Turkey's foreign policy was Western- and status quo-oriented and risk-averse. This policy was gradually transformed in the 1990s—mostly because of Turkey's renewed interest in European Union (EU) membership, resulting in its candidacy in 1999. Moreover, the post-Cold War environment and regional developments, particularly conflict in the Balkans, raised public support for a more proactive policy.

Despite the conventional wisdom that Turkey's proactive foreign policy dates back only to the last decade, the Turkish political elite has been struggling to refurbish Turkish foreign policy since the end of the Cold War. In fact, in a parliamentary speech in 1992, Hikmet Çetin, Minister of Foreign Affairs from 1991 to 1994, positioned Turkey "at a crossroads, meeting point of a key region, Atlantic, Europe, Eurasia region, that with the help of scientific, technological and economic potential would turn into a locomotive of global peace and welfare."² His successor, İsmail Cem, who held office between 1997 and 2002, was even more determined in his claim to bring Turkey into the new millennium as a bridge between Europe and Asia. Cem's book *Turkey*

in the New Century shows this keen effort to shift Turkey's static foreign policymaking into a more active role by underscoring Turkey's leadership potential in its immediate region.³ Nevertheless, the country's political and economic instability in the 1990s prevented the foreign policy elite from pushing this new objective further. Turkey experienced unstable coalition governments, strong military tutelage, and a cycle of devastating economic crises, which finally resulted in the notorious watershed for the Turkish economy in 2001. Overall, political and economic limitations, with which Brazil also struggled for decades, curbed the Turkish political elite's aspirations to become a regional if not a global player until the 2000s.

The uneasy left-center-right/ultranationalist three-party coalition government, established after the 1999 elections, started picking up the pieces of the economic ruins, as the International Monetary Fund stepped in with the strictest economic policies of the Turkish Republican era. Not surprisingly, shortly thereafter, the government was voted out and the AKP came to power in the November 2002 general elections. Since then the new Islamist/liberal/conservative coalition—the political elite that was amalgamated in the AKP—has fundamentally altered Turkish foreign policy. While traditional Turkish foreign policy ensured the continuation of the status quo, defined by allying with the West within NATO's collective security umbrella, the new foreign policy has become progressively proactive under the academic/politician and former Minister of Foreign Affairs and current Prime Minister Ahmet Davutoğlu. This time around, a thriving economy assisted Davutoğlu and the government not only in defining aspiring objectives but also in implementing them. With a leadership ready to change the status quo in foreign policymaking, Turkey at last obtained the means to claim its rising power status, similar to the path followed by other rising powers such as Brazil.

The AKP government views power as the ultimate tool to accomplish policy objectives in “a very dangerous geopolitical environment” in reference to the Middle East. Portrayal of Turkey's geopolitical situation as dangerous is not new. However, whereas previous administrations followed a security-based, risk averse policy, this chapter argues that the AKP policy focuses on climbing the up the ladder of international hierarchy and rising from a weak/middle power to rising middle/great power status in the system. Consequently, the present text builds on the literature that argues that Turkey is attempting to reimagine and reassert its role and power in the current international system through discourse and action.⁴ This policy choice is not coincidental, but rather the result of rational policy calculations. In other

words, rising power politics pay—and like Brazil, Turkey strategizes its foreign policy for that payoff.

Several instruments are available to rising powers to participate, and enforce their terms, in the system. Establishing and strengthening bilateral political and economic relations with advanced and developing countries is one such instrument. However, a rather effective means for rising powers to pursue their policy agendas is through international organizations and their conflict resolution mechanisms. As Joseph Nye aptly puts it, “[n]onetheless, for all its flaws, the United Nations (UN) has proved useful in its humanitarian and peacekeeping roles where states agree, and it remains an important source of legitimization in world politics.”⁵ As do most major powers, rising powers seek legitimization through international organizations such as the UN. In a world where conflict has changed form but not necessarily ceased, combining hard and soft power to pursue national interests has become a viable strategy. In fact, Nye argues that not using soft power to balance one’s hard power can be expensive, as in the case of the United State’s decision to launch the Iraq War of 2003 without an applicable Security Council resolution.⁶

In the case of Turkey, the political elite’s intention to use the country’s soft and hard power to renegotiate its rising role in the Western and non-Western world conferred an instrumental role upon international organizations and multilateral interventions. In this sense, Turkey’s contributions to multilateral interventions have been strategically used to augment the country’s political and economic influence in its periphery: the Balkans, Lebanon, Afghanistan, and Africa.⁷ Turkey has also signaled to the EU that it does not need its membership to expand its economy.

The signal sent through interventions particularly in Iraq, Afghanistan, and the Balkans is that the EU needs Turkey for its own economy and security more than Turkey needs the EU for its economy.⁸ The next section examines the changing nature of Turkey’s role in peace operations and how international interventions are used to pursue the country’s national interests and enhance its rising power status.

The changing nature of Turkey’s role in international peacekeeping

After the Korean War, in which it deployed 15,000 troops and lost 733 lives, Turkey refrained from participating in international interventions until the end of the Cold War.⁹ In the 1990s, the political elite deemed Turkey’s contributions to the EU, NATO, and the Conference (later

Organization) for Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE/OSCE) missions in the Balkans and the Caucasus necessary to highlight Turkey's normative and security commitment to the West. At a time when Turkey was struggling to secure EU membership, these missions were a way to show where Turkey's loyalties lay and how useful it could be for the West. To a lesser degree, Turkey took part in UN operations such as the UN Operation in Somalia (UNOSOM) II in Somalia for the same reason; here a Turkish general officer became the Force Commander.

Turkey's intervention policy became clearer in the 2000s. A concept document on *Turkey's Contribution to Peacekeeping and Peacebuilding Operations*, which was signed by then-Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan on 15 March 2005, has shaped Turkey's peacekeeping and peacebuilding policy over the past decade. The first principle in the document is the requirement of international legitimacy of the peacekeeping operation for which troops are requested. This means the mission must be mandated by a UN Security Council (UNSC) resolution.

Second, missions to certain regions such as the Balkans, Central Asia, and the Middle East are prioritized over others in the policy document.¹⁰ Third, certain international organizations were deemed more important than others: NATO, the EU, the UN, and the OSCE, respectively. In recent years, as Turkey's bid for the EU membership weakened, the UN has replaced the EU in terms of priority. Finally, the policy document highlights the importance of clear mission objectives so that the costs and benefits of contributing to the mission can be assessed in the parliament before voting takes place. Turkey's major principle has been to avoid zones of open conflict, and probably for this reason, its police contributions to peace operations have always been higher than its military contributions.

The most recent interventions to which Turkey has contributed heavily in its periphery, such as the UN Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) and the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan, show that the country is now more willing to get involved in peace operations than it has been in the past. The UN has become part of Turkey's new multidimensional foreign policy as Turkey's past goal of maintaining its Western alliances has evolved into emerging as a regional power and a global player in the international system. The UN is now perceived as a "world" organization as opposed to just another "Western" institution such as NATO or the EU.

Moreover, Turkey's definition of periphery has also been changing and broadening. Turkey funded and served in several UN peace operations in Africa, including in Sierra Leone, Djibouti, Burundi,

Congo, Sudan, and Cote d'Ivoire—11 missions in total as of writing. However, Turkey's military troop contributions have been mostly symbolic in these missions, whereas in 2004 it "ranked third after Jordan and the United States in providing police officers to peace operations."¹¹ Nevertheless, Turkey has been the rising power least willing to deploy personnel to multilateral peace operations over the period from 2002 to 2011, compared with Brazil, Indonesia, or South Africa.¹² In sum, although there has been an increase in Turkey's contributions to peace operations in the world from the 1990s to the 2000s and beyond, it has not yet caught up with other rising powers. Still, Turkey is accepted as an important actor by Western powers in international peacekeeping, especially for missions in the Middle East and Africa, because of its rising popularity in its periphery. Consequently, the governing Turkish political elite perceives peace operations in the Middle East and Africa instrumentally, as means to increase Turkey's power and prestige in the international system.

For example, in February 2013, the High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, Catherine Ashton, requested assistance for the EU mission in the Central African Republic (CAR) mission from Turkey. Davutoğlu and Ashton's phone call was reflected to the Turkish media as a sign of how Turkey is highly sought as a contributor to peace operations. Davutoğlu was said to explain to Ashton how Turkey is very active in African peacekeeping and peacebuilding efforts, for example training the Gambian police forces. Moreover, Davutoğlu highlighted the massacres carried out against Muslims in the CAR and promised to support operations against these massacres. While the government denied any request of military assistance by Ashton, it promised to consult the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Armed Forces General Staff, the national intelligence agency (MIT), and the Turkish Cooperation and Development Agency (TIKA) before taking any action. Deploying troops would also require parliamentary approval.

A week before his telephone conversation with Ashton, Davutoğlu used the CAR issue in an EU Political Dialogue meeting in Brussels to show his counterparts how he had already discussed with the African Union and the Organization of Islamic Conference (OIC) an action plan, which included setting up an observer mission, a meeting of foreign ministers, and eventually the appointment of a special representative. As Davutoğlu highlighted the details of his conversation with OIC General Secretary Iyad Medeni, it was clear that he wanted to tell the EU ministers that the region could handle its own problems, and Turkey would lead these local efforts. Interestingly, however, while the

EU representatives in Brussels requested troops from the Turkish, American, Canadian, Georgian, Norwegian, and Serbian militaries for a mission under French General Philippe Ponties, Davutoğlu insisted that the Turkish foreign ministry had been asked only for general assistance, but not troops.¹³ It was not until after UN Secretary General Ban Ki-Moon's phone call to Erdoğan, and deliberations in the government, that Turkey decided to deploy troops and an aircraft to the CAR mission.¹⁴

In sum, the nature of Turkey's contributions to international interventions, and particularly peace operations, has changed from passive to active, as its foreign policy has changed from weak middle power to rising middle power politics. Multilateralism has developed into the main principle in Turkey's foreign policy, and peace operations have become a significant part of multilateralism for the Turkish policy making elite, as was the case for Brazilian decision makers. The next section will elaborate on how this change took place, and whether Turkey's normative responses to peacekeeping aligns with other rising powers' normative and behavioral standards.

Turkey's normative responses to intervention

Although Turkey has always been committed to Western international organizations such as NATO as part of both of its strategic alliance with the United States and its overarching security concerns, it has been less interested in other international organizations. Current Prime Minister Ahmet Davutoğlu, Tayyip Erdoğan's foreign policy advisor since 2002 and Minister of Foreign Affairs in 2009–2014, renewed Turkey's interest in multilateralism and international organizations such as the UN in the last decade. In fact, Turkey is officially claimed to be

emerging as a center for international organizations in recent years, including the U.N. Turkey currently hosts the U.N. Population and Development Fund's regional office, Secretariat [for] Black Sea Economic Cooperation, and the Turkish Cooperation Council.¹⁵

Turkey has mostly complied with the norms in these and other international organizations and, as will be explained, has been eager to take on a more active role in the UN Security Council as a non-permanent member. The renewed interest in the UN is largely a part of Turkey's foreign policy goal of emerging first as a regional, subsequently as a global power in world affairs, as clearly defined by Davutoğlu in

several of his writings and speeches. In his 2010 book *Strategic Depth*, Davutoğlu uses an analogy of a “bow and arrow” where he argues that the more Turkey’s bow extends backwards to Asia, the further its arrow will advance into Europe.¹⁶ Hence, from Davutoğlu’s perspective, becoming a regional power or a central country depends on first strengthening ties to the periphery, that is to say, the Middle East.¹⁷ The concepts of center and periphery—and the objective of moving from the periphery to the center—are often highlighted in Davutoğlu’s writings.¹⁸ He understands and acknowledges that bilateral relations cannot move a state from the periphery to the center, whereas multilateralism can.

Davutoğlu emphasizes the significance of developing “the instruments in dealing with existing multilateralism”, as “the interdependence paradigm puts a special importance on three channels, which are highly relevant in Turkey’s recent foreign policy activism: multiple channels of communications, an absence of hierarchy among the issues (the rejection of the high politics vs. low politics dichotomy), and a diminished role for military power.”¹⁹ Thus, Davutoğlu stresses international organizations’ overall importance for Turkey and its soft power.

Turkey and rising powers’ soft power

What constitutes rising powers’ soft power? In particular, how do rising countries such as Turkey and Brazil pursue rising power politics using multilateralism? As Turkey began to maneuver to be a global player using its soft power, it became more interested in regional multilateral policies, particularly in Afghanistan, Iraq, Iran, Libya, and more recently Syria. Officially, Turkey’s aims in the region can be summarized as “achieving peace, security, stability and prosperity in its region and beyond through cooperation based on political dialogue, economic interdependence and cultural harmony.”²⁰ In practice, Turkey, similar to other rising powers such as Brazil, has tried to achieve these goals through soft power, by capitalizing on three major strategies: humanitarian and development aid, mediation, and peace operations.

First, Turkey has complied with central countries’ normative behavior of extending humanitarian aid to developing countries, especially in Africa. In 2011, Sinan Ülgen from Carnegie Europe explained that “the official aid budget for Turkey is around 1.5 billion [US] dollars and it gives aid to about 98 different countries around the world. So in many ways there is a new assertiveness, a new visibility, and a growing regional footprint in Turkish diplomacy.” In 2013, the *Zaman* newspaper, which was a loyal supporter of the AKP at the time, further

argued, “Turkish intellectuals, TV shows, aid organizations and the Hizmet movement have become important components of the country’s soft power, whether they aim for it or not.”²¹ Brazil followed a similar strategy and over the last decade, more than half of its humanitarian assistance has gone to sub-Saharan Africa, particularly to Somalia and Haiti.²²

Second, Turkey tried very hard to take on a mediator role between Syria and Israel, different factions in Lebanon, and Afghanistan and Pakistan, and to contribute to the Middle East peace process through its religious affinity with Palestinians—although these attempts failed when relations with Israel declined during the Mavi Marmara flotilla incident. The Turkish political elite used Turkey’s Muslim and secular identity to argue that it can be a model and a neutral mediator to solve the region’s issues. Brazil followed a similar strategy in its immediate periphery (South America) and elsewhere (Africa and the Middle East), trying to portray itself as a neutral third party and a rising power to soft-balance conflicts between several parties.²³ Moreover, in May 2010, Turkey and Brazil attempted to negotiate a deal between the “P5+1” states and Iran over the latter’s nuclear program.²⁴ Although this mediation attempt failed, Turkey and Brazil’s efforts to work within the current normative framework of the West persisted.

Finally, as previously stated, Turkey’s contributions to peace operations increased in the 2000s, despite falling short of what other rising powers contribute to peacekeeping. Nevertheless, Turkey’s normative approach to humanitarian interventions and peace operations mostly remained in line with the existing framework established by advanced countries, akin to many other rising powers including Brazil. Çetin argues that while Turkey respects the sovereignty of other states, as a signatory to the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the European Convention on Human Rights and a party to the European Court of Human Rights, it cannot “remain irresponsive to genocides, war crimes, crimes against humanity, and ethnic cleansing.”²⁵

In that vein, Turkey aligns with the EU on R2P and the protection of civilians (PoC).²⁶ In fact, it has called on the UN to intervene in the Syrian conflict, and Ahmet Davutoğlu harshly criticized the UNSC deadlock resulting in non-intervention in Syria.²⁷ For example, in his speech to the UN General Assembly on 28 September 2012, Davutoğlu strongly urged the UN to act on the conflicts in Syria and Palestine, and accused the international community of not trying hard enough to build peace and security in developing countries.²⁸ Although Turkish policy on interventions has been mostly pragmatic and its foreign

policy has strictly followed the non-intervention norm in the past, Cenap Cakmak argues that “in the Syrian crisis, Turkish foreign policy has been overwhelmingly normative.”²⁹

The AKP government discursively used the R2P principle to build a coalition of more than 90 countries to support the Friends of Syria opposition against the Assad regime and to call for the UN Security Council to fulfill its PoC duties by intervening in the Syrian conflict.³⁰ Interestingly, Brazil was reluctant to join Turkey’s efforts for Syria, and offered instead the “responsibility while protecting” concept; however, the concept did not get much initial support from Turkey or advanced powers.³¹

As another example of compliance with norms of global governance, Turkey initially objected to intervention in Libya, as it was concerned that France would act unilaterally in this intervention. Once the mission was mandated by the UNSC and supported by the Arab League, and after NATO asked Turkey to deploy troops, the AKP government agreed to the Libya mission.³² Brazil, on the other hand, abstained on UNSC Resolution 1973, which authorized intervention in Libya, and it has not been responsive to many other calls for contributions to intervention.³³

Following in Brazil’s footsteps, in recent years Turkey has begun to criticize harshly the practice of the norms instilled by the Western powers. For instance, in the 63rd session of the UN General Assembly on 24 July 2009, Ambassador Fazli Corman warned the body that many states had begun to perceive the R2P as a new form of colonialism, and that the principle needed to be defined and implemented carefully.³⁴

Furthermore, while Davutoğlu’s discourse points to using peace operations in Africa for leverage and power enhancement in the international system, Erdoğan’s discourse adds to the harsh critique of the West. His chief former policy advisor of many years, former academic Ibrahim Kalin, points to Erdoğan’s denunciation of the West as exploiters of African riches in his speech at the Gabonese Parliament on 6 January 2013:

Erdoğan criticized Africa’s Western colonizers and said Turkey is not one of the countries that sees diamonds and gold when it looks at the impoverished continent ... The prime minister said those who exploited Africa’s natural riches and even its population in the form of slavery will sooner or later be held accountable for what they did.³⁵

More interestingly, Erdoğan stated that

[t]here is a very meaningful saying here in Africa that when the flood comes, fish eat the ants and when the flood recedes, ants eat the fish. No one should rely on their current might and superiority because who eats whom depends on the flow of water.³⁶

Erdoğan's accusations to the former colonizers are perhaps subtle; however, his bringing up the subject of "the legacy of the Ottoman Empire, which was the symbol of peaceful coexistence in Africa for centuries" is rather crafty. The AKP's discourse on multiculturalism and the Ottoman Empire is often used to show African states that Turkey is nothing like the imperialist colonizers:

The Ottoman Empire never acted on imperialist ambitions. It rejected outright imperialism. It never interfered with the language, beliefs, culture or lifestyle of any country and it never was like those who exploited the riches of other countries.³⁷

The AKP elite suggests that an empire of 600 years that extended from the Middle East to Africa and Europe was not imperialist while the West still is; hence the Turkish presence in Africa through peace operations and development aid should be more desirable than that of its Western peers. Finally, Turkey challenged norms at least in one instance. During a UN debate on peacekeeping, Russia and Turkey pled for "socio-economic issues to be early peacebuilding tasks, despite disagreement on whether a peacekeeping mission is the most appropriate instrument to achieve these goals."³⁸

Turkey's criticism of global governance has mostly been on the practice of peace operations, thus this example of challenging established norms on how socioeconomic issues in a country should be handled is a rare example of Turkey's attempt at norm revision. Moreover, while the Turkish elite discursively challenges the West and its norms at times, no action has been taken to actually challenge the implementation of the norms of global governance. Thus, the discourse seems to be used to affect the public opinion of the periphery, that is African and Middle Eastern nations, as well as the domestic constituency in Turkey.

In sum, all of these proactive regional policies, and the use of soft power, contributed to Turkey's pursuing a non-permanent seat in the UNSC, after 47 years of absence, in 2009–2010. Brazil also pursued a seat during the 2010–2011 term of the UN Security Council using similar strategies and cooperation with other rising powers in international alliances such as IBSA (India-Brazil-South Africa) and

BRICS (Brazil-Russia-India-China-South Africa).³⁹ Clearly, international organizations such as the UN have become strategic tools for middle powers to fulfill regional and global aspirations with the ultimate goal of rising in the hierarchy of states in the international system and enhancing national interests.

The path from the periphery to the center: rising middle power politics, norms, and peacekeeping

As portrayed thus far, the Turkish case is not unique. The Turkish foreign policy elite strategizes the country's foreign policy and particularly peacekeeping policy in the same manner as Brazil or any other rising middle power does. A strand in the literature approaches the foreign policy behaviors of countries such as Turkey, Brazil, and South Africa among others in the framework of "new" or "emerging" or "rising" middle powers.⁴⁰ The necessity to distinguish between traditional middle powers and new middle powers stems from the structural and behavioral differences between the countries that can be included in these two categories. Canada, Turkey, Norway, and Brazil cannot be conceptually analyzed within the same middle power category, after all. Then how are rising middle powers different from traditional middle powers?

Eduard Jordaan summarizes the characteristics of middle powers using liberal, realist, and critical theoretical literatures as "[l]iberals (such as Cooper, Higgott and Nossal) emphasize agency in middle-power foreign policy, realists (such as Holbraad) focus on state capacity, whereas neo-Gramscians (such as Cox and Neufeld) privilege the position of middle powers in the global political economy and elite complicity in the neo-liberal project as explanatory variables."⁴¹ Traditional middle powers are economically privileged, democratic, stable, and complacent in a globalized world. Rising middle powers, on the other hand, are only recently flourishing economically; they are stabilizing their political regimes and are at different stages of democratization and in some cases such as China, far from being democratic.

As realists have long argued, countries that increase their economic and military capabilities beyond those of weak powers find their place in the international system as middle powers to help major powers maintain the international regime that they have established.⁴² Middle powers have similar vested interests in the system to the great global powers, thus their compliance in the international regime is rational. Consequently, middle powers are internationalists and active in international organizations, seeking to further the hegemonic political and

economic agenda. Although these characteristics apply to the recent phenomenon of rising middle powers, there are important differences between the new and old middle powers.

Jordaan finds that rising powers are more reform-oriented as they are newcomers to a system of states and they are structurally different (i.e. less affluent or democratic) than other middle powers.⁴³ Moreover, these rising countries retain “non-structural forms of power and influence associated with the energetic and creative use of their diplomatic talents.”⁴⁴ Thus, they combine “hard power” and “soft power” in a way that lets them revise their position in the system to become regional and global players. Do rising powers challenge the system amicably through norm contestation, or do they follow established norms?

Building on the Turkish case, I argue that rising middle powers use soft power, such as a Third World solidarity discourse or amicable calls for norm revision as well as mediation attempts, to not to be compelled to use force to accomplish their revisionist goals. As previously mentioned, in 2010, Turkey pursued a mediator role along with another rising power, Brazil, to strike a deal between the West and Iran, and pushed the UN for a peaceful resolution of the Iran issue. This was quite the impossible task for both countries involved, and it consequently failed. However, the effort raised eyebrows in the American media, which questioned why these two allies of the West would seemingly try to ally with Iran, a longtime rogue state.

Columnist Thomas Friedman went so far as to describe the agreement brokered by Brazil and Turkey “as ugly as it gets” in a *New York Times* editorial piece.⁴⁵ More interestingly, Friedman mocked the two states for trying to “play at the big power table,” which was indeed what Brazil and Turkey were doing, although they did not see anything wrong with that. It is unlikely that they perceived this mediation effort as “challenging” the West. On the contrary, they were attempting to demonstrate to the West their usefulness and how their surging soft power could be of practical use in the peaceful resolution of conflicts. Shortly thereafter, the Obama administration not only declined the brokering efforts of Brazil and Turkey, but further strengthened sanctions against Iran.

The efforts of these two rising powers to revise their passive position in the UN system did not end well; however, this incident is quite remarkable in showing that rising powers follow similar strategies to work within the norms of the established global governance and at times can cooperate to pursue their strategic interests. Indeed, when necessary, they may try to reform the rules of the international regimes

established by great powers. In fact, according to Jordaan, rising middle powers “do occasionally challenge hegemonic rudiments, thereby strengthening ties with the minnows in their geographic immediacy and in South-dominated international organizations.”⁴⁶ Nevertheless, the rising powers mostly stay within the dictates of the existing regime, hence they are more norm-abiding than norm-breaking.

As the Turkish case demonstrates, international interventions, particularly peace operations, are good examples of why and how even UN missions can be strategically used to enhance a country’s position in the international system vis-à-vis other middle powers and regional actors. As Kai Michael Kenkel posits, “[d]edication to multilateral institutions is the primary hallmark of middle power foreign policy,”⁴⁷ and “peace operations provide an important profile enhancement tool for emerging powers.”⁴⁸

Rising middle powers are willing to use this foreign policy instrument resourcefully more often than traditional middle powers, which rather selectively utilize these channels to maintain the existing order—mostly a traditional Cold War function of middle powers. Since the post-Cold War surge in rising power aspirations, the goal of these countries is not only to maintain the existing order, but also to enhance their own rising position in the system. Thus, peacekeeping is a power-enhancing venue for their long-term political ambitions. For regionally strong power holders like emerging powers, peace operations provide a bridge to obtaining global power and declaring it to great powers that may or may not be assigning a middle power role to them. This is rather obvious in the Turkish political elite’s psyche, as can be seen in Davutoğlu’s writings.

Moreover, peacekeeping operations serve as a way to launch bilateral relations with countries that would otherwise be unlikely or too costly. Middle powers that possess the economic capabilities and political willingness to reach out to international organizations and take more active part in multilateral endeavors such as peacekeeping missions do so under strategic calculations. The objective is to enhance national interests in a globalized world where relations no longer revolve around bilateral alliances. Thus, several instruments are available to the middle power that envisions itself as a rising power. Peace operations are among those instruments, and a rather less politically costly option compared with mediation attempts that may not be supported by major powers.

As Wiharta *et al.* put it, “to a large extent, the current approach and agenda of contemporary peace operations have been shaped by the political support, funding and the normative priorities of the Global

North, while being largely implemented by the Global South.”⁴⁹ Hence the economic burden of peace operations in the UN is mostly taken on by great powers⁵⁰ and human costs are not particularly high in most missions. States like Turkey may choose not to get involved in hot conflict zones and limit their troops to a mere handful, hence making these missions even less costly. Moreover, peacekeeping becomes less costly for rising powers as their principle of action is “to focus on integrated development and peacebuilding over peace enforcement; and engagement based on cultural affinity and close contact with the host country population.”⁵¹ Despite the rather low costs, peace operations help “assert the position of regional leader as well as it serves international objectives, including the aspiration to become a permanent member of the UN Security Council” and rising powers “demonstrate a capacity to play with great powers.”⁵²

While scholars expect to see a clash between rising powers and great powers, as the Turkish case demonstrates, such a clash is the exception rather than the rule. Despite similarities that make it possible to categorize countries under the rising power banner, and while some rising powers cooperate at times as in the example of Turkey and Brazil, these countries do not form a cooperative effort to challenge any established rules and norms in international organizations. If anything, as Turkey did in the case of Syrian civil conflict, they ask the Western countries to more effectively enforce the rules that they themselves established. Rising powers often object to the use of force, and Brazil has asked to supplement R2P with RwP, and even abstained from the voting on resolution that called for the Libya intervention. However, that too seems to be more an exception than the norm. In fact, “many have assumed that rising powers will form a bloc of ‘norm breakers’ contesting prevailing norms and setting alternate ones. However, when the BRICS countries ... gathered in Rio de Janeiro in June 2010 to develop ‘perspectives from the South’ as part of the UN’s New Horizon consultation process, the outcomes were remarkably close to mainstream policies.”⁵³

Overall, rising powers appear to be norm takers as opposed to norm makers or breakers. In the long term, this may change, and rising powers may contest norms, as Turkey and Brazil exceptionally tried to do; however, in the short term, despite their inflammatory rhetoric, rising powers do not behave so differently from traditional middle powers that follow existing rules and practices. As Tardy aptly puts it, “the peacekeeping-peacebuilding field may not be worth the fight that normative divergences can entail.”⁵⁴

Conclusion

Turkish foreign policy under the AKP government and Ahmet Davutoğlu's leadership has become more proactive in discourse and action since 2002. It is debatable whether the policies bore success, but there is little question about Turkey's aspirations to become a rising power. Although this was the goal of the previous few governments, it was only after the 2001 economic crisis that both domestic and international factors aligned to the advantage of the country, inspiring the political elite to challenge Turkey's weak/middle power status in the international system. As the economy thrived and the new business elite pushed the political elite to search for new export markets, it became more important to revise Turkey's position in its periphery and with regard to the center. Ahmet Davutoğlu, an academic and the architect of this proactive foreign policy, envisioned changing Turkey's position as that of a bridge country (which also meant liminal, bridging the periphery to the center but still remaining as a peripheral country)⁵⁵ trying to passively exist under the Western strategic security umbrella (NATO) and the political and economic hegemony of the West (European Union), not only into that of a "center country" but also a "global player" that actively pursues its national interests.⁵⁶

At that juncture, enhancing bilateral relations and implementing "zero problems with the neighbors" policy with Turkey's immediate periphery became the first strategy Davutoğlu followed. Multilateralism and active participation in international organizations followed as a secondary strategy. When the primary policy failed as relations with Iran, Israel, and Syria soured, multilateralism became the primary objective. The United Nations has long attracted Davutoğlu's attention as a world organization, and he supported an intense campaign first for the 2009–2010 UNSC non-permanent seat and then for a seat in 2015–2016. To achieve his goal, Davutoğlu and Erdoğan paid frequent visits to African countries, sent police and troops to African peace operations, and provided further assistance to missions such as that deployed by the ERU to the Central African Republic. In fact, Erdoğan has recently been declared "the hero of Somalia" by the former Somalian special envoy to the United States, Ambassador Abukar Arman, in an analysis of Erdoğan's recent visit to several African countries including Somalia.⁵⁷ In reality, Turkey's military presence in UN peacekeeping, especially in Africa, remained mostly token contributions, meaning the manpower sent to missions was negligible but the presence of the country in several missions stood out.⁵⁸ The perception that Turkey has become a

regional power and a global player that can and will have a say in world affairs is readily constructed in the Middle East and Africa.⁵⁹

Turkey's path from the periphery to the center is not unique and the implications for other rising powers are manifold. Weak/middle powers like Turkey and Brazil that recover from political and economic instability seek to increase their leverage in the international system through various means such as humanitarian aid, mediation, and peace operations. Along with other rising powers such as Brazil, Turkey prioritized all three of these strategies in its foreign policy-making. Turkey and Brazil sought to mediate various Middle Eastern conflicts and Brazil has become more active in conflicts in its periphery. In contrast with traditional middle powers, countries like Turkey and Brazil are still politically and economically developing; however, they aspire to become rising middle powers using multilateralism and international interventions strategically.

While both Brazil and Turkey strictly followed the norm of non-intervention until the last decade, a more proactive foreign policy initiative meant playing active roles in particularly regional peace operations as well as missions further afield. While traditional middle powers such as Canada subscribe to a notion of "good global citizenship," rising powers such as Brazil and Turkey employ peace operations as strategic tools to increase their influence in the international system. Despite Brazil and Turkey's outspoken objections to implementation of certain norms such as the R2P in certain instances such as Libya or Syria interventions, and their calls for revisions of norms and their practices, both rising countries have remained within the established normative frameworks in peacekeeping and other domains of global governance, that is mediation and humanitarian aid. This is no coincidence, as rising powers, despite all their soft power and ambition to rise from the periphery to the center, strategically work within the established system and rarely cooperate with one another long enough to evolve into norm breakers, shapers or makers.

Notes

- 1 Joseph S. Nye, Jr., *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics* (New York: Public Affairs, 2004).
- 2 Hikmet Çetin, "Dışişleri Bakanı Hikmet Çetin Tarafından Dışişleri Bakanlığı 1993 Mali Yılı Bütçe Tasarısının TBMM Genel Kurulunda Görüşülmesi Vesilesiyle Yapılacak Konuşma," (21 December 1992) (Ankara: TC Disişleri Bakanlığı 1992): 5. Quoted in Lerna Yanik, "The Metamorphosis of 'Metaphors of Vision': 'Bridging' Turkey's Location, Role and Identity After the End of Cold War," *Geopolitics* 14, no. 3 (2009): 537.

- 3 İsmail Cem, *Turkey in the New Century* (Mersin: Rustem Yayinevi, 2001).
- 4 Yanik, "Metamorphosis."
- 5 Nye, *Soft Power*, 146.
- 6 Ibid., 27.
- 7 Nil S. Satana, "Turkey," in *Providing Peacekeepers: The Politics, Challenges and Future of United Nations Peacekeeping Contributions*, eds. Paul D. Williams and Alex Bellamy (Oxford University Press, 2013), 355–376.
- 8 "Erdogan: Turkey Has Vigor the EU Needs Badly," *Newsweek*, 17 January 2011.
- 9 A. Kadir Varoglu and Adnan Bicaksiz, "Volunteering for Risk: The Culture of the Turkish Armed Forces", *Armed Forces and Society* 31, no. 4 (2005), 587.
- 10 Anonymous author interview at the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 17 January 2012.
- 11 İtir Bağdadi and Ozan Arslan, "Challenges to Peace Operations in the 21st Century: Concluding Remarks" in *Challenges to Peace Operations in the 21st Century* (Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Security İzmir University of Economics, İzmir, Turkey, 5–7 April 2006), eds. Siret Hürsoy and Nesrin Ada, 152.
- 12 "SIPRI Multilateral Peace Operations Database," www.sipri.org/databases/pko.
- 13 Uğur Ergan, "AB Orta Afrika için Türkiye'den asker istiyor," *Hürriyet*, 15 February 2014.
- 14 "UN asks for Turkish troops to join EU force in CAR," *Today's Zaman*, 25 February 2014.
- 15 See Turkey. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, "Candidacy of the Republic of Turkey to the United Nations Security Council for the period 2015–2016" (n.d.), www.mfa.gov.tr/candidacy-of-the-republic-of-turkey-to-the-united-nations-security-council-for-the-period-2015-2016.en.mfa.
- 16 Ahmet Davutoğlu, *Stratejik Derinlik: Türkiye'nin Uluslararası Konumu* (İstanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2010), 45–65.
- 17 Ziya Öniş and Şuhnaz Yılmaz, "Between Europeanization and Euro-Asianism: Foreign Policy Activism in Turkey during the AKP Era," *Turkish Studies* 10, no. 1 (2009): 7–24.
- 18 Davutoğlu, *Stratejik Derinlik*.
- 19 Mustafa Kutlay, "Economy as the 'Practical Hand' of 'New Turkish Foreign Policy,'" *Insight Turkey* 13, no. 1 (2011): 67–88.
- 20 See Turkey. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, "Policy of Zero Problems with our Neighbors" (n.d.), www.mfa.gov.tr/policy-of-zero-problems-with-our-neighbors.en.mfa.
- 21 "Turkey has become more visible due to activities of 'non-state' actors," *Today's Zaman*, 3 April 2013. The "Hizmet movement" is the religious order led by Fethullah Gülen, who has been residing in the United States since 1999. The Gülen movement had been a loyal ally to the AKP since 2002; however, the two cliques have been in a bitter fight since December 2013.
- 22 See www.globalhumanitarianassistance.org/countryprofile/brazil.
- 23 Javier Ciurlizza, "Brazil's Foreign Policy and Latin America: A New Chapter?," 1 December 2014, <http://blog.crisisgroup.org/latin-america/2014/12/01/brazils-foreign-policy-and-latin-america-a-new-chapter>.
- 24 Alexei Barrionuevo and Sebnem Arsu, "Brazil and Turkey Near Nuclear Deal With Iran," *The New York Times*, 16 May 2010.

- 25 Hikmet Çetin, "Humanitarian Intervention, responsibility to protect, and Turkey's approach," *The Journal of Turkish Weekly*, 13 February 2015.
- 26 See www.responsibilitytoprotect.org/files/R2P_State_Chart.doc.
- 27 See "FM calls for UN resolution to gain humanitarian access to Syria," *Today's Zaman*, 15 February 2013.
- 28 See Turkey. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, "Dışişleri Bakanı Davutoğlu BM Genel Kurulunda uluslararası topluma birlik ve beraberlik içinde hareket edilmesi çağrısında bulundu," 2012, www.mfa.gov.tr/disisleri-bakani-davutoglu-bm-genel-kurulunda-uluslararasi-topluma-birlik-ve-beraberlik-icinde-hareket-edilmesi-cagrisinda-bulundu.tr.mfa.
- 29 Cenap Cakmak, "Turkey and the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) in Syria," *Bilgesam Analysis/Middle East* 1123, 3.
- 30 Cakmak, "Turkey."
- 31 See Oliver Stuenkel, "Emerging powers remain divided on R2P and RWP," *Post-Western World*, 8 July 2012, www.postwesternworld.com/2012/07/08/why-emerging-powers-are-divided-on-r2p-and-rwp.
- 32 Sharon Wiharta, Neil Melvin And Xenia Avezov, "The New Geopolitics of Peace Operations: Mapping the Emerging Landscape," *SIPRI Report* (2012):16.
- 33 Conor Foley, "Welcome to Brazil's version of 'responsibility to protect,'" *The Guardian*, 10 April 2012.
- 34 See Fazli Corman's speech at www.globalr2p.org/media/files/turkey-2009-r2p-debate.pdf.
- 35 Ibrahim Kalin, "Türkiye ve Afrika: Yeni bir stratejik ufka doğru," *Today's Zaman*, 14 January 2013.
- 36 Kalin, "Türkiye ve Afrika."
- 37 "Turkey sees in Africa friends and brothers, not diamonds, Erdoğan says," *Today's Zaman*, 8 January 2013.
- 38 Wiharta *et al.*, "New Geopolitics," 22.
- 39 Carlos Enrique Ruiz Ferreira, "Brazil as a Non-Permanent Member of the UN Security Council During the 2010–2011 Term," *Global Policy and Development Report*, Friedrich Ebert Stiftung (2012).
- 40 Eduard Jordaan, "The Concept of a Middle Power in International Relations: Distinguishing between Emerging and Traditional Middle Powers," *Politikon* 30, no. 2 (2003): 165–181.
- 41 Jordaan cites these sources as A. F. Cooper, R. A. Higgott, and K. R. Nossal, *Relocating Middle Powers: Australia and Canada in a Changing World Order* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1993); C. Holbraad, *Middle Powers in International Politics* (London: Macmillan, 1984); Robert W. Cox and Timothy Sinclair, *Approaches to World Order* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).
- 42 See Kenneth N. Waltz, *Theory of International Politics* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1979); Stephen D. Krasner, ed., *International Regimes* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1983); Volker Rittberger, ed., *Regime Theory and International Relations* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995).
- 43 Jordaan, "Concept," 176.
- 44 Andrew F. Cooper, "Niche Diplomacy: A Conceptual Overview," in *Niche Diplomacy: Middle Powers after the Cold War*, ed. Andrew. F. Cooper (Basingstoke, Macmillan, 1997), 9.
- 45 Thomas Friedman, "As Ugly As It Gets," *New York Times*, 25 May 2010.

- 46 Jordaan, "Concept," 176.
- 47 Kai Michael Kenkel, "South America's Emerging Power: Brazil as Peacekeeper," *International Peacekeeping* 17, no. 5 (2010): 646.
- 48 Thierry Tardy, "Emerging Powers and Peacekeeping: an Unlikely Normative Clash," *GCSP Policy Paper* 2012/3, 1.
- 49 Wiharta *et al.*, "New Geopolitics," 17.
- 50 Paul D. Williams and Alex Bellamy, eds., *Providing Peacekeepers: The Politics, Challenges and Future of United Nations Peacekeeping Contributions* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).
- 51 Kenkel, "Emerging Power," 656.
- 52 Tardy, "Emerging Powers," 2.
- 53 Wiharta *et al.*, "New Geopolitics," 19.
- 54 *Ibid.*, 1.
- 55 Yanik, "Metamorphosis."
- 56 Davutoğlu, *Stratejik Derinlik*.
- 57 Abukar Arman, "Erdogan: The Hero of Somalia," *aljazeera.com*, 21 January 2015. The President became even more popular in the country when he did not cancel his visit to Somalia after an al-Shabab bombing killed two police officers at a Mogadishu hotel where Turkish delegates were staying. Erdogan received an honorary degree at the Addis Ababa University and condemned the attack and al-Shabab: "[i]f they are doing it in the name of Islam, there is no such thing in Islam." See www.huffingtonpost.com/2015/01/22/shabaab-bomb-mogadishu-hotel_n_6522838.html.
- 58 Satana, "Turkey."
- 59 Hakan Yavuz and Mujeeb R. Khan, "Turkey Asserts Its Role in the Middle East," *New York Times*, 11 February 2015.